DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 307 678 EA 020 945

AUTHOR Osterman, Karen F.
TITLE Supervision and Shared Authority: A Study of Principal and Teacher Control in Six Urban Middle Schools.
PUB DATE Mar 89
NOTE 24p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, CA, March 27-31, 1989).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Decision Making; *Educational Administration; *Educational Environment; Intermediate Grades; Leadership Responsibility; Middle Schools; Organizational Development; *Participative Decision Making; Public Schools; School Administration; School Based Management; *Supervision; *Teacher Administrator Relationship; Teacher Supervision; Urban Schools

ABSTRACT

Addressed is the administrative dilemma of principals' and teachers' sharing decision-making and its effect on strong instructional leadership. The findings were developed as part of an exploratory field study conducted in six public middle schools in a large urban school system. The sample consisted of five black male and one white female principals and 186 teachers (69 percent black and 70 percent female). At the completion of the field study, a questionnaire including the measures for the four research variables was distributed to all classroom teachers generating a 97 percent response. In addition, doctoral candidates observed interactions of principals and teachers in each school. Findings indicate that supervision and distribution of authority are processes that can enhance teacher control. Their correlates, amenability to control and mutual adjustment, are organizatonal characteristics that contribute to a more positive and probably more productive environment. It was evident that administrators resist shared decision-making because of its apparent inconsistency with strong instructional leadership. (30 references) (SI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED307678

Supervision and Shared Authority

A Study of Principal and Teacher Control in Six Urban Middle Schools

Karen F. Osterman, Ph.D
Hofstra University

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Karen F. Osterman

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, Ca., 1989

EA 020 945

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

INTRODUCTION

Words and terms such as collegiality, collaboration, shared decision- making, teacher empowerment and participatory management have infiltrated the language of educational administration. It is generally accepted that the role of teachers in schools must change, that teachers must be given greater authority to influence school policies and practices, and recommendations to restructure decision processes within schools are regularly incorporated into reform proposals. Yet, despite the apparent support for shared decision-making, schools remain highly bureaucratized, decision processes remain highly centralized and teachers in the majority of schools remain largely disenfranchised. (Carnegie, 1988).

According to Bolman and Deal(1984), the choice of administrative strategies is influenced by concepts of how organizations should be structured: we construct organizations in our images of how they should be. Educational administrators' concepts of how schools should function emerge from a deeply engrained heritage of bureaucratic control.

Schools have been, and for the most part still are, highly centralized bureaucracies and leadership behavior has been shaped by traditional bureaucratic concepts. In the bureaucratic model, there are sharp distinctions between the roles of leaders and followers, between administrators and teachers. According to Tannenbaum (1968), the traditional view of organizational control reflects the belief that the supply of leadership capability is limited, that subordinates are less capable of exercising decision-making authority than leaders, and that organizational effectiveness is optimized by reducing individual discretion on the part of all but the few leaders.

Within this traditional model, "strong" leadership is defined as control and empowerment of teachers means loss of control on the part of the building administrator: leaders lead and members follow. Strong leadership is evidenced in compliance not in concensus and leadership is achieved - not by including teachers in decisions - but by excluding them.

Given the radical nature of the proposed reforms within the context of our bureaucratic heritage, resistance to change is not surprising. To many, collaborative decision-making is time-consuming, inefficient and inconsistent with strong leadership. Principals fear that allowing teachers to assume a management role will erode their own authority and reduce their

role to a perfunctory one at best. To many principals, sharing authority with teachers contradicts basic assumptions about leadership at a time when there are renewed calls for principals to provide, in the vernacular of effective schools research, "strong instructional leadership."

Within the context of traditional organizational theory, these dual demands for "strong" leadership and shared decision-making constitute a conflicting and apparently paradoxical dilemma for the administrator. How can the principal exercise strong leadership - provide the direction necessary to guide and direct the efforts of the teachers within the school - and at the same time, share that authority with teachers?

This study addresses the administrative myths underlying this apparent dilemma and poses two questions: 1. If principals share their authority with teachers, does their own authority diminish and 2. Does empowering teachers require that principals relinquish or abandon their efforts to exercise "strong instructional leadership"?

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND HYPOTHESES

Distribution of Authority

Review of the literature establishes a strong rationale for sharing authority with teachers. DeCharms' (1968) maintains that the desire for personal causation is a basic motivational need and the experience of personal causation is a key motivational element. This theoretical proposition is supported by research in a variety of organizational settings which establishes that the experience of individual control, as distinct from participatory decision-making (Morse and Lorsch, 1970; Fiedler, 1966; Bridges,1967) is associated with differences in attitudes and work behavior.

Studies have established that when individuals experience control in the work environment, their attitudes toward themselves, their colleagues and the work itself are more positive (Tannenbaum and Allport, 1956; Mann and Hoffman, 1960; Hofstede, 1968; deCharms and Bridgeman,1961; Schmidt, 1977). Workers who experienced control were not only more receptive but were also more responsive to control processes, the supervisor and the organization itself and experienced greater feelings of self-actualization and satisfaction with work and the work environment.

Distribution of authority has also been associated with qualitative differences in performance: high rate of participation in organizational task situations (Coch and French, 1948; Tannenbaum & Kahn, 1958; Tannenbaum, 1961); greater cooperation with co-workers and supervisors, and higher levels of productivity (Coch and French, 1948, McKay, 1970; deCharms, 1976; deCharms, Dougherty & Wurtz, 1965); greater clarity in specifying goals and goal-directed activity (H. Jackson, 1976). A classic study by Cillie (1940) associated differences in teacher authority with differences in instructional experimentation, responsiveness to individual needs, freedom for pupils and cooperation between principal and teachers.

In contrast, when organizational work situations were structured so that individuals were unable to exercise authority, research found that there was more conformity, caution, unquestioning acceptance of authority and a lack of innovation (Child, 1973; Leavitt, 1965); perceived deprivation, high role conflict and attitudinal militance (Alutto and Belasco (1972); perception of dependence and subordination (Child, 1973; Leavitt, 1965); and low satisfaction with the organization (McKay, 1970; Tannenbaum and Kahn, 1958).

On the basis of this research, we can anticipate that distribution of authority within the school will be related to two dimensions of organizational behavior described here as amenability to control and mutual adjustment.

Distribution of authority refers to the extent to which the principal shares authority rights with teachers to enable them to exercise control over decisions and actions which affect their own performance. The link between control and work performance is an important distinction because research demonstrates that individuals don't want control for its own sake but as a means to enable them to influence work conditions.

Amenability to Control is defined as an openness and responsiveness to the leadership efforts of the supervisor and a willingness to comply with directives.

Mutual adjustment refers to the nature of work relationships among colleagues. Mintzberg (1979) defines mutual adjustment as an organizational control mechanism through which its

members collectively assume responsibility for the coordination and direction of their own performance and direct their own efforts in a coordinated manner toward the achievement of individual and organizational goals. According to Burns and Stalker(1961), mutual adjustment is more likely to occur in organizational which are organic rather than bureaucratic. In these organic networks, there are differences in the nature of communication and work relationships which enable members to exercise control over the work of the organization. In an organic network, work relationships are characterized by a high level of communication (horizontal as well as vertical) focused on organizational tasks. Members share information and advice intended to improve the quality of performance and ability to achieve organizational goals. They are willing to work with others, and assume responsibility , not only for their own work, but for the organization as a whole. In organizations characterized by mutual adjustment, members establish high standards, view themselves as part of a team and work cooperatively for the success of the whole.

Supervision

If the experience of control is an important motivational element which positively impacts on teachers' organizational behavior and organizational effectiveness, what are the implications for the principal? Does the need to respond to the desire for control on the part of teachers require that principals relinquish their role as "strong instructional leader"?

The conceptual confusion over the phrase "strong instructional leadership" complicates any discussion of this nature (Murphy, 1988). For our purposes here, instructional leadership is defined as direct supervision of teacher performance. Control is essential aspect of organizational life. If an organization is to be effective in achieving its goals, it must coordinate and direct the performance of its members toward the achievement of common goals. In schools, the principal has formal authority to exercise control over the work performance of teachers. Although organizations control work performance in different ways, one of the primary means used by principals is direct supervision. Direct supervision is a control mechanism through which the organizational leadership establishes individual and organizational goals and monitors actions of the membership relative to these goals.

The question then becomes, does direct supervision on the part of the principal reduce teacher authority and minimize the level of control which teachers can exercise? Research suggests that

this is not necessarily the case. As deCharms (1968) explains, the desire for personal causation is not a generic desire for control, but the desire to be effective in producing changes in one's own environment. For an individual to experience personal causation, certain situational elements are essential. The individual needs to be able to establish personal goals within the context of organizational goals and to determine the actions necessary to achieve those goals within established guidelines. They need to be able to assess their own performance relative to goals and objectives in a realistic manner and be willing and able to assume personal responsibility for achievement of their goals. Assuming that the tasks are viable given their abilities and resources, they should be able to strive to achieve those goals with a reasonable measure of confidence in their ability to succeed.

Supervision is a control process, but it is also a process which provides the information which is essential to the experience of control within the work setting. In fact, the lack of supervision can reduce member control. If organization fails to provide members with clearly defined goals, rules, role expectations and responsibilities, the ambiguity of the situation may contribute to personal frustration and dissatisfaction and limit opportunities for effective performance (Nord & Durand, 1975; Dressler, 1976). In contrast, organizational control mechanisms such as rules may provide employees with more autonomy since they know what they can and cannot do (Crozier, 1964).

In this study, the concept of supervision is operationalized using the evaluation model developed by Dornbusch and Scott(1977). This model incorporates six supervisory tasks which require the supervisor to identify organizational goals, establish performance criteria, collect information on performance and outcomes, assess performance relative to established criteria, communicate these findings to the worker and provide support and guidance in developing plans to improve performance if necessary.

Strong Instructional leadership as defined here is an essential ingredient of teacher control. The evaluation process outlined by Dornbusch and Scott enables the supervisor to exercise control over work performance; and at the same time, it establishes a communication process and provides information which enables teachers to function more effectively within the school. Consequently, we anticipate that the supervision contributes to the experience of personal control and will therefore be associated with the same effects: Amenability to Control and

Mutual Adjustment.

METHODOLOGY

The findings presented here were developed as part of an exploratory field study conducted in six public middle schools in a large urban school system. The predominantly black, inner-city, low-income schools ranged in size from 315 to 720. The principals, five black males and a white female, were all veterans in the school system with at least five years of experience. The 186 classroom teachers were predominantly Black(69%) and Female (70%) with an average age of 40 and an average of 13 years teaching experience. Most had been in the system for 12 years, in the same school for over 6 years and with the same supervisor for an average of 3.5 years.

Data Collection

Doctoral candidates spent approximately one day per week in each school over a six month period, observing principal and teacher interaction in each school. Observations were supplemented with conversations and interviews with teachers and principals. At the completion of the field study, a questionnaire including the measures for the four research variables was distributed to all classroom teachers (N=186, response 97%).

Measurement of variables

The measures of the variables were based on data from teacher questionnaires and supplemented by observational data:

Supervision

The items asked teachers to report the frequency with which the principal performed each evaluation task relative to four dimensions of their own teaching tasks: teaching subject matter, maintaining control, character development and record-keeping.

Distribution of Authority

The Origin Climate questionnaire developed by deCharms and associates consists of 30 items that focus on the role of the principal in establishing work conditions to enable teachers to exercise control in performance of their tasks.

Mutual adjustment

The measure is an 8 item scale, based on the work of Burns and Stalker, which examines the frequency of task-oriented communication and interaction among staff members in the school.

Amenability to Control

This measure consists of 6 questions which examined perceived level of agreement between teachers and principals on priorities, goals, procedures, and the frequency with which teachers incorporated suggestions from principal with respect to each of the four teaching tasks: teaching subject matter, character development, maintaining control and record keeping.

Data Analysis

Questionnaire responses were analyzed using a combination of regression and analysis of covariance. In addition, observational data were used to develop profiles of the research variables within each school. These profiles graphically illustrated the individual concepts in behavioral dimensions and provide a validation of the statistical findings.

FINDINGS

Quantitative Analysis

The first hypothesis proposed that Distribution of Authority would be positively correlated with two variables: Amenability to Control and Mutual Adjustment. This was confirmed.
There were significant differences between the six schools on each measure. Simple correlations established that Distribution of Authority is significantly correlated with Amenability to Control and with Mutual Adjustment between and within schools.

The second hypothesis proposed that supervision would be positively correlated with Amenability to Control and Mutual Adjustment. This hypothesis was supported in part.
Supervision was significantly correlated with Amenability to Control between and within schools; but Mutual Adjustment was significantly correlated with supervision only within schools.

Within the theoretical framework, supervision and distribution are described as important processes which jointly influence levels of mutual adjustment and amenability to control; they are integral aspects of principal behavior. Using a combination of multiple regression and

analysis of covariance, the relationship between the combined measures of principal behavior supervision and and individual dimensions of teacher behavior was examined. Again, the relationship between amenability to control and these measures of principal behavior were significant between and within schools; while the relationship with mutual adjustment was significant only within schools.

Table 1: Correlations between Distribution of Authority, Supervision, Combined Measures of Principal Behavior and Amenability to Control and Mutual Adjustment: Between Schools (N=6) and Within Schools (N=170).

	Amenability to Control		Mutual Adjustment	
	Between	Within	Between	Within
DA	.80*	.72**	.69*	.53**
Sup	.76*	.75**	.379	.39**
Sup+DA	.79**	.82***	.64	.54***

* p. <.05

** p. <.01

*** p. <.001

These findings suggest that if principals provide instructional leadership and at the same time enable teachers to exercise instructional leadership, that it is likely to anticipate that teachers will be more responsive to their directives and also more likely to engage in collaborative effort to achieve the school's goals.

Consequently, they provide a partial response to the questions posed at the beginning of the study: if principals share authority with teachers, their own authority will not necessarily diminish and shared decision-making does not require that principals relinquish or abandon their efforts to exercise "strong instructional leadership."

Qualitative Analysis

An examination of the conditions in several schools in the sample will further illustrate these concepts and their relationship in a more meaningful way and perhaps demonstrate in a more

convincing fashion that supervision and distribution of authority enhance teacher control and support organizational conditions which contribute to school effectiveness.

As indicated, there were significant differences in dimensions of principal and teacher behavior between the schools in the sample. These variations are illustrated in the context of four schools. Classifying scores as High or Low relative to the means, in School 1, the principal received high ratings on both measures, supervision and distribution of authority to teachers. In Schools 2 and 4, principals' ratings were high on distribution of authority, but low on supervision. In School 3, the principal received low ratings on both supervision and distribution of authority. Consistent with the statistical findings, the Amenability to Control and Mutual Adjustment scores varied accordingly. For discussion purposes, the first school will be referred to as the Collegial model; Schools 2 and 4 will be described as Laissez-faire models and School 3 will be the Principal Dominant.

Table 2: Means and Rank Order of Supervision, Distribution of Authority, Amenability to Control and Mutual Adjustment Measures by School

School	Sup	DA	Sup+DA	AC	MA	AC+MA
1	3.73 (1)	2.72 (3)	6.45 (1)	4.72 (1)	3.02 (1)	7.74 (1)
2	2.72 (5)	2.74 (2)	5.46 (3)	4.14 (4)	2.89 (2)	7.03 (3)
3	2.90 (3)	2.02 (6)	4.92 (6)	3.82 (6)	2.37 (5)	6.19 (6)
4	2.58 (6)	2.66 (4)	5.24 (4)	4.25 (3)	2.73 (3)	6.98 (4)
5	2.77 (4)	2.31 (5)	5.08 (5)	4.03 (5)	2.20 (6)	6.23 (5)
6	3.31 (2)	2.75 (1)	6.06 (2)	4.70 (2)	2.50 (4)	7.20 (2)
All	3.06	2.55	5.53	4.32	2.63	6.89

Table 3: Classification of Scores on Each measure Relative to the Mean for the Sample

	Sup	DA	AC	MA
1	Hi	Hi	Hi	Hi
2	Lo	Hi	Lo	Hi
4	Lo	Hi	Lo	Hi
3	Lo	Lo	Lo	Lo

Schools 2 and 4: The Laissez-Faire Schools

In both of these schools, as indicated above, the measures of distribution of authority are above the mean for the sample, but the scores on the measure of supervision are the lowest in the sample.

Although the principals in these schools were very different philosophically, their management strategies were similar. Both adopted a laissez-faire style of leadership allowing teachers to do wht they wanted without intervention, positive or negative. Neither involved themselves in teacher evaluation for different reasons. One felt that teachers were working to the best of their capability and his job was not to help teachers teach. The other felt that supervision was a waste of time and energy. On the basis of teacher reports, self-reports and observation, neither spent much time with teachers, in or out of classrooms, and little time in discussion of instructional issues.

When they did interact with teachers, it was with a few teachers - not teachers who needed support or direction, but teachers with whom they felt most comfortable. In the one school, these were senior teachers with whom the principal had worked for many years. In the other, it was a group of lunch room "cronies" - the home ec teacher, an aide, an eighth grade teacher and a police officer who ran a sports program in the school.

The principals' attitudes toward instruction resulted in a great deal of autonomy for individual teachers within the the classrooms and within grade level teams, but their authority in school-wide matters was limited and in neither school were teachers collectively able to influence school policies and practices. Some teachers exercised authority by virtue of their personal relationship with the principals, but representative groups such as the Teacher Advisory Councils had little or no influence in either school with their recommendations being largely ignored. The one principal's clear distinction between instruction and management precluded any collaboration between teachers and principal. His job was management (which he didn't do well) and their job was instruction. The other principal felt so powerless within the "system" that she avoided any problems and focused primarily on maintenance issues advising her teachers not to complain, not to rock the boat and not to take things too seriously: "We'll always have that problem to some extent. Don't take burdens on your shoulders."

The laissez-faire approach of the principals was reflected in the attitudes and behavior of teachers towards one another, toward students, and towards the principals. Although both principals made few demands of teachers, teachers were generally resistant to their directives, requests or suggestions. New ideas or proposals were met with antagonism. Teachers didn't read memos or follow recommended procedures. They came late, didn't sign in, and left early. They didn't submit forms or keep accurate files and resented being asked. In one case, a staff meeting was called and no one showed up. In another, teachers remained aloof from the proceedings reading newspapers and marking report cards.

Although the levels of mutual adjustment in both of these schools were relatively high for the sample, they are somewhat misleading. In comparison to school 3, there were more positive contacts among teachers in these schools, but the frequency and extent are far below the ideal. Communication and interaction among staff members tended to be social and informal. Some teachers were part of an informal network, some weren't.

Among teachers, the prevailing atmosphere was described as "live and let live;" "those who do, do and vice versa." Although individual staff members were perceived as supportive and helpful, there was little communication among teachers as a group and people tended to stay in their own cliques, a condition aggravated by the omission of common planning time in the schedule.

For experienced teachers, the isolation was evident but not problematic. As one teacher commented, "I keep to myself and I'm not affected by issues outside of class. I do my job and they leave me alone." For teachers with problems, this autonomy was described as isolation. For these teachers, there was little support from colleagues. On the contrary, teachers were highly critical of one another, particularly of those who were unable to handle their own problems. Interpersonal relationships and communication were highly formal and unsupportive and, in many instances, openly hostile and antagonistic.

In these schools, then, we find principals who avoid involvement in instructional matters, who stay away from classrooms, avoid interaction with teachers. At the same time, they do not interfere in any direct fashion in the teachers' classroom work. They are not supportive, nor are they restrictive.

From the perspective of the teachers, the situation in these schools was not bad. Although teachers, in general, did not feel very effective or find their work highly gratifying, they were not oppressed. Teachers reported that they feel relatively good about themselves and many had chosen to remain in their respective schools rather than face a worse unknown. According to an assistant principal, "those who have worked under tyrants are especially appreciative."

At the same time there were many teachers who were demoralized, frustrated, and discouraged; teachers who "used to try to do 'neat' projects" but are not "just trying to survive"; teachers whose goals are "getting through the year"; teachers who, when required to develop mini-courses reported that they tried to come up with ideas that wouldn't appeal to anybody. In some instances, teachers attempted to deal with problems but the overall tendency of teachers was to avoid joint action and responsibility. Teachers would take matters into their own hands when things got out of hand, when they could, but there was an absence of intentional or directed involvement in establishing policy, goals or direction. Team leaders, for example, were viewed primarily as informational conduits and they did not seem to have or want responsibility for the team's activities.

School 3: Principal Dominant

Although the situation in these schools was not optimum, it was still better in many instances than the last school in the sample, a school in which apparently neither principal nor teacher exercised control. Teachers have little or no influence over their own work or work conditions. The principal clearly rejects the notion that teachers can or should exercise leadership authority. In his efforts to enforce his own policies and control instruction in the school, he restricts interaction among teachers even on a purely social basis. Their inability to exercise control in the work environment is accompanied by frustration, feelings of incompetence and lack of self-worth, conflict, divisiveness, lack of communication, helplessness and a lack of effort to improve instruction.

In this school , the principal's goals and objectives were very much focused on improving the instructional process but, in an almost tragic sense, his efforts to achieve those goals were self-defeating. He accepted responsibility for the quality of education, but felt that he would be successful only to the extent that he could maintain complete control over what happened in the school. Toward that objective, he maintained a highly visible presence, personally contacting

every teacher in the school on a frequent basis. (During 16 hours of observation, although only 2 were spent with teachers, he managed to contact every teacher on the staff.) But, from observations and comments of the principal and teachers, he maintained a very narrow view of the supervisory process, one restricted primarily to establishing goals and objectives and then determining whether or not teachers were complying with his orders. Within his organizational schema, teachers played no part.

His efforts to control extended into the classroom. The principal imposed rigid expectations for classroom performance and accepted little input from teachers. There was only one right way - his way. The distinction between amenability to control and compliance is evident here. Using threats and punishments, he was effective in achieving compliance but at a high price.

The principal's determination to limit teacher authority and influence within the classroom as well as the school affected every aspect of teacher behavior. Teachers in the school seldom interacted with other teachers in the school and, in the absence of support from their colleagues as well as the principal, teachers generally appeared to be demoralized, frustrated and unable to approach their teaching task with creativity or effort.

There was little communication, let alone productive communication in the school. Team meetings were infrequent, relationships between groups of teachers were characterized by tension and mistrust, and teachers were not involved in extra curricular activities. Teachers avoided the principal, they avoided one another, and they avoided students. Since they were held strictly accountable for student behavior, teachers minimized contact with students both in and out of class to curtail any sort of teacher-student confrontation.

Teachers assumed that the principal was largely unsympathetic to their demands and spent a great deal of time and energy trying to cope with his demands and expectations. Some tried to work around obstacles to make the classroom more tolerable for themselves and their students. Others tried to operate within the strict guidelines established by the principal but spent a lot of time and energy complaining. Few seemed to be involved with their teaching, there was little variation in classroom instruction, few used materials other than the recommended text, and many talked of leaving in the coming year.

The majority of the staff expected "something more" at the school. They wanted more flexibility, more opportunities for teachers to work together as a cohesive group, more choices, more involvement in developing curriculum and schedules. Within the context of these unmet expectations and lack of control, teachers were demoralized and both unwilling and unable to do anything extra in the classroom or school: "Teachers have absolutely no input into anything and it has just killed the morale around here." "We talk with him but we know that no one in the school carries any real weight with him... When it's all said and done, he's going to do what he wants to do. That's why no one goes out of their way to try to do things because they know it will not make any difference... it will not change a thing. Plus, the risk is too great for any one teacher to challenge him - the teacher always loses in the long run. He does just what he wants."

School 1: The Collegial Model

This school presents a striking contrast with the other schools in the sample. Expressing his belief that the failure of teachers to teach or students to learn is his own failure, the principal in this school focused his efforts on improving the quality of instruction and teacher performance in the school adopting a model of supervision which paralleled the evaluation process outlined by Dornbusch and Scott. Observation as well as teacher reports confirmed that he was continuously involved in providing guidance and direction to teachers to enable them to improve their performance. While continually encouraging them to ever better performance, he personally recognized and complimented their efforts. Relying extensively on full-faculty and team meetings as well as formal classroom observations and numerous informal visits, he provided feedback and technical assistance to teachers in an effort to simplify their work and increase their effectiveness and would do whatever was necessary to respond to their needs.

He accepted his personal responsibility for the quality of instruction within the school, but at the same time, he felt that a success could only be achieved with the full support and involvement of the teachers - not as subordinates but as equal partners in a joint venture. Recalling his own teaching experience, he described his "hero", a principal who "got teachers to pull together. They ran the school and tried all different kinds of curriculum strategies. Today, kids from that school are the leaders of the community." Teacher authority was viewed, not as a threat, but as an essential ingredient of an effective school.

This philosophy was clearly evident in the administrative leadership which he provided in the

school. He assumed leadership but at the same time allowed and encouraged teachers to involve themselves in the school. He not only accepted the legitimacy of teachers' involvement in determining school policy and practice but felt that it was his responsibility to encourage and enable them to exercise collective control.

The score on the mutual adjustment measure was the highest in the sample with teachers reporting a high level of interaction within teams and between all teacher groups. Observations confirmed these reports. Teachers frequently shared not only advice but also time and expertise. Their interaction was cooperative. They knew what their colleagues were doing, recognized their efforts and praised their successes. They were also aware of their colleagues' deficits and provided support as needed. They were committed to the school as well as to their individual classes and this commitment was reflected in their willingness to assume personal responsibility for problems which arose. If the problem required action on the part of the principal, they would make that clear and the principal would do what was necessary.

Teachers had authority and they took control. Faculty and team meetings and lunch room discussions focused on instruction and kids. Teachers individually and collectively evaluated their own progress and that of their students, set their own goals and took action independent of the principal. They critically examined procedures and materials they used and often revised, supplemented or developed new materials. They assumed responsibility for the success of their own efforts and, in many cases, accepted responsibilities and tasks which were not their own. They identified problems and in numerous instances developed and implemented solutions. In one case, the principal brought a particular matter to their attention only to find that they had already dealt with it.

In this school, individual teachers and groups of teachers appear to independently exercise such a great deal of authority that it was difficult to differentiate between principal and teacher control. The principal did not rely on extrinsic control mechanisms and seldom tried to directly control teachers' work behavior. Nonetheless, there was a high level of control evident in the school. No one gave orders, but everyone knew what to do. No one person or group of persons exercised more control than others and, with few exceptions, everyone was generally aware of others' needs and responsive to those needs. There was a common understanding and agreement among the teachers about teaching and educational goals and no evidence of resistance to the

strong leadership which the principal provided.

For teachers, this was "a good place to be," " like heaven," particularly in comparison to (another school), where"the principal had no relationship with the kids, the kids had no respect for teachers and there were lots of discipline problems." These problems were not evident in this school. Teachers treated students with understanding and respect and often spoke of the love which teachers and the principal have for kids, but were quick to point out that "love" doesn't mean permissiveness. In the classroom, teachers set challenging but reasonable goals and espoused a philosophy which called for support and constructive criticism. They assumed that these children could succeed and encouraged them to do so. They maintained high standards, but applied them flexibly and fairly. Even a teacher whose relationships with the principal was highly antagonistic described the school as " a winner: it has good vibes." Another said "They'd have to drag me out of here."

In general, the observational data are consistent with the quantitative findings and lend strength to the hypotheses that supervision and distribution of authority are processes which can enhance teacher control and that their correlates: amenability to control and mutual adjustment, are organizational characteristics which contribute to a more positive and probably more productive environment.

DISCUSSION

Amenability to Control

Statistically, the level of Amenability to Control is significantly related both to Supervision and to Distribution of Authority, a finding which is supported by observational data. The extent to which teachers are responsive to principal directives apppears to be related both to the extent to which the principal clearly defines goals and expectations and also to the extent to which principals and teachers share a concensus regarding those goals, objectives and performance criteria.

Teachers in this study were consistent in their attitudes toward the principal's involvement in the supervisory process: they wanted the principal to evaluate their work, they wanted to do a good job, they wanted to know what was expected of them and how their work was assessed, they wanted assistance in identifying their own strengths and weaknesses and they wanted to improve

the quality of their performance. When supervision was not forthcoming, they were frustrated. They resented the principals' neglect and interpreted the principals' non-involvement as a lack of interest in them and in the instructional process in general. In the absence of direct supervision, they questioned the value of their work and felt that their efforts were unrecognized as well as unrewarded.

The observational data suggest that Distribution of Authority influences the attitudes and behavior of teachers through its effects on concensus. If the principal clearly defines goals and expectations and then enables teachers to influence those goals and expectations, the goals and expectations are no longer those of the principal but those of the teachers as well. The majority of principals in this sample did not allow themselves to be swayed by the opinions of their teachers, conflicts were not resolved and, given these discrepancies, it is unlikely to expect that teachers would be responsive to the control efforts of the principals.

The level of concensus between principal and teachers and the responsiveness of teachers to leadership efforts seemed largely unaffected by the way that teachers felt about the principal as a person. All of the principals in the sample were viewed as well-intentioned and good people, but teachers were highly critical of their shortcomings as administrators. If principals did not respond to professional needs of teachers, teachers did not respond to their requests. In school 1, the principal, described by his peers as "Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee," was a master in dealing with the system and getting what his teachers needed. He not only accepted the legitimacy of teacher involvement in decision-making, but also accepted the legitimacy of their right to make decisions and his own responsibility to implement those decision. The obvious effort which he exerted to respond to their requests was undoubtedly a factor in increasing their sense of control as well as the extent to which they were willing to respond to his leadership.

In comparison, given the bureaucratic realities of any large urban school district, the inability -and, in several cases, an apparent lack of interest - of the other principals to provide adequate supplies, materials and space posed real problems for teachers, diverted their attention from instructional issues and increased their antagonism toward the administrator.

Mutual Adjustment

The statistical analysis confirmed that while Distribution of Authority was positively

correlated with Mutual Adjustment, Supervision was not. Although Supervision does appear to be important in establishing conditions necessary for teachers to exercise control over their own work, it is apparent that the evaluation process in itself does not establish the conditions necessary to enable teachers to function together as a group.

The correlation between mutual adjustment and distribution of authority, however, appears to be a logical one: teachers cannot effectively exercise collective control unless the principal makes it possible for them to be involved in the decision process. If they are to exercise mutual adjustment, they need and want encouragement and opportunities to exercise authority and engage in cooperative action with the principal and with their colleagues.

That the principal plays an important role in mutual adjustment is supported by supplementary analysis which examined the correlation between mutual adjustment and the number of years that teachers had spent with the same principal. The correlation was significant .19 ** but, interestingly, the direction of the relationship differed between schools in a way which would be expected. In the collegial school, for example, there was a high positive correlation: .46** while in School 2, one of the laissez-faire schools, the relationship was -17.

Observations in the collegial school suggests several ways in which principal encouraged mutual adjustment. The schedule was arranged to provide teachers with planning time: Grade level teams had common planning periods and faculty meetings and sectional meets were regularly scheduled and devoted to instructional issues rather than administrative matters. Aside from providing opportunity and an agenda , the principal actively brought teachers into the decision process both on a formal and informal basis. He frequently solicited advice and suggestions. He asked about their problems; he asked for their recommendations; he asked for their input and advice on how things should be done and often turned decisions over to them. He also encouraged task communication and interaction among teachers, referring them to other teachers for advice or assistance and enabled groups of teachers: teams and committees, to exercise decision-making authority independently. This emphasis on instruction and problem-solving created a climate which encouraged teachers to become involved in setting the course for the school.

CONCLUSIONS

Given the predominance of bureaucratic models of control in schools, administrators resist

shared decision-making because of its apparent inconsistency with "strong instructional leadership." At the same time, many may resist direct supervision because they believe that it is inconsistent with teachers' desires and needs for personal and professional control. This study challenges both of these "myths."

The study provides evidence of a positive correlation between two dimensions of principal behavior: supervision and distribution of authority, and two dimensions of teacher behavior: amenability to control and mutual adjustment. These findings suggest that principal control and teacher control are not incompatible, that distribution of authority does not necessarily diminish principal authority nor does supervision necessarily diminish teacher authority. To the contrary, the study shows that supervision is an administrative process which can enhance teacher control and effectiveness to the extent that it recognizes and responds to teachers' motivational needs to experience personal causation in the work environment. This process of empowerment, in turn, enhances the principal's effectiveness as an instructional leader.

Tannenbaum maintains that organizational control is cumulative: that the organization's ability to direct the performance of its members will increase to the extent that the organization also enables its members to exercise control over their own task performance. Although this study did not systematically examine effectiveness, the findings presented here challenge traditional assumptions of bureaucratic control which assume that organizational effectiveness is somehow contingent on differential distribution of authority or an unequitable balance between leader/member control and provides further support for the non-traditional model proposed by Tannenbaum.

At a practical level, the study supports the position that supervision and distribution of authority are both administrative processes which enhance teacher control and that empowering teachers, through its effects on motivation, establishes the groundwork for a positive and productive school climate characterized by high levels of communication, personal responsibility, commitment, concensus, cooperation and collaboration between principal and teachers.

REFERENCES

Alutto, Jos. A., and Belasco, James A. "Patterns of Teacher Participation in School System Decision-making," Educational Administration Quarterly, vol. 9, no. 1, Winter, 1972, pp. 27-41.

Bolman, Lee G., and Deal, Terrence E. Modern Approcaches to Understanding and Managing Organizations. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Pub., 1984

Bridges, E.M. "Model for Shared Decision-making in the School Principalship," Occasional Paper Series, no. 2, St. Ann, Mo.: Central Midwestern Regional Educational Laboratory, 1967.

Burns, Tom and Stalker, G.M. The Management of Innovation. London: Tavestock Publ., 1961.

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. Teacher Involvement in Decison Making: A State-by-State Profile. Sept. 1988.

Child, John. "Strategies of Control and Organizational Behavior," Administrative Science Quarterly, vol. 18, no. 1, March, 1973, pp. 1-17.

Cillie, Francois S. Certralization or Decentralization? A Study in Educational Adaptation. Contributions to Education, no. 789. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1940.

Coch, Lester and French, J.R.P. Jr. "Overcoming Resistance to Change," Human Relations, 1948, 1, pp. 512-532.

Crozier, M. The Bureaucratic Phenomenon. Univeristy of Chicago Press, 1964.

deCharms, R. Enhancing Motivation: Change in the Classroom. New York: Irvington, 1976.

DeCharms, R. Personal Causation. New York: Academic, 1968.

deCharms, R. and Bridgeman, W.J. "Leadership Compliance and Group Behavior." Technical Report No. 9, 1961. ONR Project Nonr 816 (11), Washington University, St. Louis, Mo.

deCharms, R., Dougherty K. and Wurtz, S. Unpublished manuscript. Washington University, 1965.

Dessler, G. Organization and Management: A Contingency Approach. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1976.

Dornbusch, Sanford M. and Scott, W. Richard. Evaluation and the Exercise of Authority. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Pub., 1977.

Fiedler, F.E. "The Contingecy Model: A Theory of Leadership Effectiveness," in H. Proshansky and B. Seidenberg, eds., Basic Studies in Social Psychology. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1966.

Hofstede, G.H. The Game of Budget Control. Assen, The Netherlands: Van Gorcum and Co., N.V., 1968.

Jackson, H. "An Assessment of Long-Term Effects of Personal Causation Training." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Washington University, St. Louis, Mo., 1976.

Leavitt, Harold J. "Some Effects of Certain Communication Patterns on Group Performance," in Basic Studies in Social Psychology, ed. Harold Proshansky and Bernard Seidenberg, N.Y.: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1965, pp. 557-592.

Mann, F.C. and Hoffman, L.R. "Automation and the Workers: A Study of Social Change in Power Plants," N.Y., 1960, cited in Tannenbaum, 1969.

McKay, D.A. "Should Schools be Bureaucratic?" Canadian Administrator. Nov. 1970, cited by E.W. Ratsoy, "Participative and Hierarchical Management of Schools: Some Energing Generalizations," Journal of Educational Administration, vol. 11, no. 2., Octobr 1973.

Mintzberg, Henry. The Structuring of Organizations. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1979.

Morse, N.C. and Lorsch, Jay, "Beyond Theory Y," Harvard Business Review. May/June 1970, pp. 61-68.

Murphy, Joseph. "Methodological Measurement, and Conceptual Problems in the Study of Instructional Leadership," Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, vol, 10, no. 2, Summer, 1988, pp. 117-139.

Nord, Walter R. and Durand, Douglas E. "Beyond Resistance to Change," Organizational Dynamics, vol. 4, no. 2., autumn 1975, pp. 2-19.

Schmidt, Gene. "What Motivates School Administrators," NASSP Bulletin, vol. 61, no. 413, Dec. 1977, pp. 49-53.

Tannenbaum, Arnold S. Control in Organizations. New York: McGraw Hill, 1968.

Tannenbaum, A.S. "Control and Effectiveness in a Voluntary Organization," American Journal of Sociology, vol. 67, 1961, pp. 33-47.

Tannenbaum, A.S. and Allport, F.H. "Personality Structure and Group Structure," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, vol. 58, 1956, pp. 272-280.

Tannenbaum, A.S. and Kahn, R.L. Participation in Union Locals. Evanston, Ill., 1958.